

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

1. Objection to Drawings Under 37 CFR §1.83(a)

This objection has been addressed by the addition of a flowchart, labeled as new Fig. 7, listing the steps recited in claim 1. The specification has been amended to refer to new Fig. 7.

2. Formalities

Claim 1 has been amended to adopt the suggestions made by the Examiner in item 2 on page 3 of the Official Action.

3. Rejection of Claims 2-3 and 5-7 Under 35 USC §112, 2nd Paragraph

This rejection has been addressed by amending claims 2-3 and 5-7 to recite the low, intermediate, and high gray levels as first, second, and third gray levels.

4. Rejection of Claims 1-3 Under 35 USC §102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,344,857 (Matono), and Rejection of Claims 4-7 Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of the Matono Patent and Admitted Prior Art

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Matono patent performs a **single** gamma correction (anti compensation) process on the sections of the gamma curve, and fails to disclose or suggest an anti compensation process for a plasma display panel (PDP) in which:

- a. the video signal is divided into at least two segments based on gray level thereof, and a variety of anti compensation processes are performed on each of the segments, as recited in claim 1; and
- b. a plurality of anti compensation processes are performed on the video signal in each respective segment with respect to various gammas, also as recited in claim 2, with the smaller gamma being used in the anti compensation process with

respect to video signals in the range of the second gray level(s) for increasing the number of gray levels therein.

By performing multiple anti compensation processes on each gray level segment, the number of gray levels in the lower segment(s) and brightness in the upper gray level segment(s) is increased, thereby preventing false contours from appearing at the lower gray level(s) and increasing the contrast in the range of the second or upper gray level(s), greatly improving the image quality of the PDP.

The Matono patent teaches an anti compensation process for various types of displays, as well as segmenting of the video signal, but there is no disclosure of performing a variety of anti compensation (“gamma correction”) on individual segments, much less using different gammas on each segment, as claimed. Instead, a common gamma correction coefficient k is applied, using an adder 16, to segments corresponding to eight sections of the gamma characteristic curve, as explained in **col. 4, lines 6-11** of the Matono patent. While Matono appears to recognize advantages of dividing the video signal into segments, Matono fails to disclose or suggest varying the anti compensation process between sections, or of using different coefficient k 's to accomplish the variation.

Since Matono does not disclose or suggest the concept of applying a variety of anti compensation processes to each segment of the video signal, as claimed, the Matono patent could not have suggested the specific processes recited in claim 4 -7. While some of these processes are known, they could not have been suggested by Matono, which discloses application of a single coefficient. Matono certainly fails to suggest use, *in each segment*, of a gamma smaller than 2.2 for low (first) gray levels, a gamma equal to 2.2 for intermediate (third) gray levels, and a gamma of greater than 2.2 for high (second) gray levels as recited in claims 5-7, nor is use of three gammas admitted to be prior art. The admitted prior art involves a **single** gamma compensation, as does Matono, and therefore neither the admitted prior art nor the Matono patent, whether considered individually or in any reasonable combination, could not possibly have suggested the claimed invention.

Serial Number 09/859,542

Because Matono only teaches application of a single gamma correction (anti compensation process) to the segments of the video signal, Matono does not "anticipate" or suggest the subject matter of any of claims 1-7, and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC §§102(b) and 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Having thus overcome each of the rejections made in the Official Action, withdrawal of the rejections and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA
Registration No. 33,805

Date: January 12, 2004

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500

NWB.S:\Producer\New\Pending 1..PK\KAO 859542w01.wpd